



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

October 20, 2004

Ms. Myrna S. Reingold
Galveston County - Legal Department
123 Rosenberg, Suite 4127
Galveston, Texas 77550-1454

OR2004-8935

Dear Ms. Reingold:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 211302.

The Galveston County Sheriff's Department (the "sheriff") received a request for the complete name of a named deputy sheriff, as well as copies of personnel and disciplinary information regarding the named deputy. You state that you have released information showing the full name of the deputy. You claim that the remainder of the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.103, 552.114, 552.117, 552.1175, 552.119, and 552.130 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

First, you advise that the records at issue in the present request were the subject of a prior ruling of this office, issued as Open Records Letter No. 2004-0782 (2004) on February 3, 2004. *See* Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (governmental body may rely on prior ruling as previous determination when 1) the records or information at issue are precisely the same records or information that were previously submitted to this office pursuant to section 552.301(e)(1)(D); 2) the governmental body which received the request for the records or information is the same governmental body that previously requested and received a ruling from the attorney general; 3) the prior ruling concluded that the precise records or information are or are not excepted from disclosure under the Public Information Act (the "Act"); and 4) the law, facts, and circumstances on which the prior ruling was based have not changed since the issuance of the ruling). We understand you to represent that the pertinent facts and circumstances have not changed since the issuance of Open Records Letter No. 2004-0782. Thus, to the extent the records at issue in the present request are identical to the records that were the subject of Open Records Letter No. 2004-0782, we

determine the sheriff may rely on that ruling as a previous determination for such records. To the extent the submitted records are not identical to the records at issue in Open Records Letter No. 2004-0782, we address your claimed exceptions to disclosure.

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides as follows:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature to which the state or a political subdivision is or may be a party or to which an officer or employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person's office or employment, is or may be a party.

....

(c) Information relating to litigation involving a governmental body or an officer or employee of a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under Subsection (a) only if the litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the requestor applies to the officer for public information for access to or duplication of the information.

Gov't Code § 552.103. A governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show that the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date the governmental body received the request for information, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *University of Tex. Law Sch. v. Texas Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, no pet.); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210, 212 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). A governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under 552.103(a).

To establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated, a governmental body must provide this office "concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture." Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). Whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). In Open Records Decision No. 638 (1996), this office stated that a governmental body has met its burden of showing that litigation is reasonably anticipated when it received a notice of claim letter and the governmental body represents that the notice of claim letter is in compliance with the requirements of the Texas Tort Claims Act ("TTCA"), chapter 101 of the Civil Practice and Remedies Code, or an applicable municipal ordinance.

You state that the sheriff reasonably anticipates litigation related to the information at issue in the present request. In support of this contention, you state that the sheriff has received a notice of claim letter that is in compliance with the TTCA, and you have submitted a copy

of the notice. Based on your arguments and our review of the submitted information, we agree that litigation against the sheriff is reasonably anticipated and that the information at issue relates to that litigation. Thus, we agree that section 552.103 is applicable to the information at issue.

We note, however, that once information has been obtained by all parties to the litigation through discovery or otherwise, no section 552.103(a) interest exists with respect to that information. Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Thus, information that has either been obtained from or provided to the potential opposing party in the anticipated litigation is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a), and it must be disclosed. Further, the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends once the litigation has been concluded or is no longer anticipated. Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

In summary, to the extent the submitted records are identical to the information at issue in Open Records Letter No. 2004-0782, the sheriff must continue to follow Open Records Letter No. 2004-0782 as a previous determination for such information. To the extent the submitted records are not subject to the previous determination in Open Records Letter No. 2004-0782, we conclude the sheriff may withhold the submitted information pursuant to section 552.103 of the Government Code. Based on these findings, we do not reach your remaining claimed exceptions to disclosure.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within thirty calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within ten calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within ten calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the

governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within ten calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Tex. Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within ten calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



David R. Saldivar
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

DRS/seg

Ref: ID# 211302

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Mr. Wesley Clements
Attorney at Law
1305 Prairie
Houston, Texas 77002
(w/o enclosures)